

*Application No. 09/626,577*  
*Attorney Docket No. RPOST-57228*

*PATENT*

**REMARKS**

Applicant is enclosing a copy of claims 84-183 with this amendment. Applicant is also enclosing copies of Exhibits A, B, and C. Exhibit A is a simplified version of the flow chart shown in FIG. 1 of the drawings in this application. Exhibits B and C are simplified flow charts of competitive systems.

Exhibit A shows a seamless arrangement in which successive steps are indicated as (1), (2), (3) and (4). In step (1), an e-mail with attachment is provided by the sender to a server which is designated as RPOST server. In step (2), the message with the attachment is transmitted to a recipient of the message. The recipient may actually constitute an agent for the recipient as shown in FIG. 1 of the drawings in this application. As will be appreciated, a digital fingerprint of the message and digital fingerprints of the attachments are also respectively transmitted with the message and the attachments from the RPOST server to the recipient. In step (3), the recipient (or the agent of the recipient) transmits to the RPOST server the delivery and routing information relating to the transmission of the message and the attachments and the digital fingerprints of the message and the attachments. In step (4), the message and the attachments and the digital fingerprints of the message and the attachment and the delivery and routing information received by the RPOST server from the recipient (or the agent for the recipient) are transmitted by the RPOST server to the sender. The system is seamless because of the transmission in successive steps from the sender to the RPOST server, from the RPOST server to the recipient (or the agent of the

*Application No. 09/626,577*  
*Attorney Docket No. RPOST-57228*

*PATENT*

recipient), from the agent to the recipient back to the RPOST server and from the RPOST server to the sender.

In applicant's system as shown in Exhibit A, the sender is not required to do anything other than to provide the document(s) to be transmitted to the recipient. Furthermore, the recipient (or the agent for the recipient) is not required to engage in any extra steps other than those specified in the previous paragraph. The advantages of the seamless system constituting applicant's invention are listed in Exhibit A. The simplicity in seamlessness of applicant's system may be seen from the fact that the four (4) steps constitute a closed loop and that each of the four (4) steps constitutes a forward movement in the loop. There is no backtracking of steps in applicant's system and method

The competitive systems shown in Exhibit B are not seamless. This may be seen from the fact that the flow of documents and information is not continuous around a loop which provides for the server at the center of the loop. This causes documents and information to backtrack between the server and the sender and between the server and the recipient. As a result, seven (7) steps are required in the flow chart in Exhibit B rather than the four (4) steps specified in Exhibit A. Furthermore, the sender is required in Exhibit B to perform other steps in addition to providing to the server the documents to be transmitted to the recipient (or the agent of the recipient in Exhibit B). The recipient (or the mail agent of the recipient) is required to perform other steps in addition to the step of receiving the document(s) through the internet from the server. The competitive

*Application No. 09/626,577*  
*Attorney Docket No. RPOST-57228*

*PATENT*

systems shown in Exhibit B are provided by such competitors of applicant's assignee as certified e-mail competitors and registered e-mail competitors among others. The disadvantages of such systems are also listed in Exhibit B. These include the following: (a) extra actions are required from the recipient, (b) there is no verification that the recipient was notified of the message from the sender, and (c) the systems are limited to document delivery.

Exhibit C shows other systems which are competitive to applicant's system. These systems have the same general competitive disadvantages as the systems shown in Exhibit B. For example, the systems are not seamless. This may be seen from the fact that the flow of documents and information is not continuous around a loop which provides for the server at the center of the loop. This causes documents and information to backtrack between the server and the sender and between the server and the recipient. As a result, seven (7) steps are required in the flow chart in Exhibit C rather than the four (4) steps specified in Exhibit A. Furthermore, the sender is required in Exhibit C to perform other steps in addition to the step of providing to the server the documents to be transmitted to the recipient (or the agent of the recipient). The recipient (or the mail agent of the recipient) is also required in Exhibit C to perform other steps in addition to the step of reviewing the document(s) transmitted through the internet from the server. The competitive systems shown in Exhibit C are provided by such competitors of applicant's assignee as Tumbleweed, ZiX mail, and Post X among others. The disadvantage of such systems are also shown in Exhibit C.

*Application No. 09/626,577*  
*Attorney Docket No. RPOST-57228*

*PATENT*

Favorable action on this application is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional costs in filing this amendment, please charge the costs to Account  
No. 06-2425.

Respectfully submitted,



Ellsworth R. Roston  
Registration No. 16,310  
Attorney for Applicants

ERR:dmc:204242.1.

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT  
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696